

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of June 19, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 67 and 82 have been amended to place the claims in a more preferred form. Claims 67, 70, 74-75, 77, 79-80, 82-83, 85-87, and 89-90 remain pending.

Claim 67 stands objected to for a minor formality. Applicants have amended claims 67 and 82 in response to the same. The present objection is rendered moot.

Claims 67, 70, 74-75, 77, 79-80, 82-83, 85-87, and 89-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Muldoon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,233,992, hereinafter referred to as *Muldoon*). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants' claims 67 and 82 each recite, among other features,
wherein the portal is not visible to the Internet,

wherein the request to log into the private network exchange is received from a first company through a first service provider of the multiple service providers,

wherein the data representing the authorization of the user to access the plurality of applications is sent to the selected application through a second service provider of the multiple service providers, the first service provider being different from the second service provider.

Specifically, *Muldoon* describes a "method and system for sending, receiving and managing the exchange of messages between an intranet and multiple external users using a secure server as an intermediary interface for Internet communications." (Abstract). *Muldoon* fails to describe multiple service providers and access within a private network by companies connected through different service providers where the portal is not visible to the Internet. In rejecting these features, the Action provides no specific support in the reference to teach multiple service providers and a first service provider of a first company being different from a second service provider of a second company. In response, the Action merely states, "providers are different for different companies." (Action, p. 3).

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), each and every feature must be described in the reference. In this case, *Muldoon* is completely lacking of any description of multiple service providers with a first and a second service provider being different service

providers. In fact, *Muldoon* fails to even make any reference to a service provider. In addition, Applicants note that different service providers for accessing a private network exchange with a portal is not an inherent feature. If the Action is taking official notice of such, Applicants respectfully request documentary evidence showing the same.

Still further, in rejecting “wherein the portal is not visible to the Internet,” the Action points to line 1 of column 4 and lines 37-47 of column 1. Specifically, line 1 of column 4 of *Muldoon* describes a portion of Figure 1. As described in *Muldoon*, Figure 1 illustrates in block 10 a simple intranet arrangement such as might be used in a Lotus Notes system. However, as described in the description of Figure 1, computers 12a and 12b are on the same internal network connected via cable 14. There is no description of separate service providers. In addition, the connection to computers 22a, 22b, and/or server 24 is through Domino server 18, which connects to the Internet. (Col. 3, l. 62-col. 4, l. 6). In specifically referencing the portion cited in the Action, referring to access between company A and B, *Muldoon* states, “when the external user accesses server 24, the server can recognize the user and associate the user with a particular one of the companies A and B. Using this recognition, the server 24 can present a customized browser interface which makes the server 24 look like the selected company.” (Col. 4, l. 63-col. 5, l. 1). As such, the portal for access is in fact visible to the Internet since, as clearly shown in Figure 1, server 24 is only accessible to a user through Internet 20 (see *Muldoon*, Figure 1).

As such, *Muldoon* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants’ claims 67 and 82. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 70, 74-75, 77, and 79-80, and 83, 85-87, and 89-90, which depend from claims 67 and 82, respectively, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim.

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 7th day of August, 2008

By: /John M. Fleming/
John M. Fleming
Registration No. 56,536

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001